E

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Class
Book

A

REFUTATION

OF THE

SOPHISMS, GROSS MISREPRESENTATIONS, AND ERRONEOUS QUOTATIONS

CONTAINED IN

"AN AMERICAN'S" "LETTER TO THE EDINBURGH REVIEWERS"

OR

SLAVERY

INIMICAL TO THE CHARACTER OF THE GREAT FATHER OF ALL, UNSUPPORTED BY DIVINE REVELATION, A VIOLATION OF NATURAL JUSTICE, AND HOSTILE TO THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

OF

American Independence.

BY JOHN WRIGHT.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal—that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." *Declaration of Independence.*

"I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; and that his justice cannot sleep forever." *Mr. Jefferson's Note on Slavery.*

"Therefore they" (the Indians) "had sent back the two Missionaries, with many thanks, promising, that when they saw the black people among us restored to freedom and happiness, they would gladly receive our Missionaries." *Elias Boudinot.*

Washington, D. C.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

1820

To JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, Esq'r.

Secretary of State.

SIR,

PERMIT me respectfully to dedicate the following pages to you. The high official station you fill: Your weight and influence in society, independent of that station: and, above all, your high character, uniform humanity, and genuine and constant adherence to the principles of Freedom and Independence, have induced me to take the liberty of connecting your name with this cause, and of placing under your patronage this well-intended, though feeble effort to contribute my mite towards bringing about an event, which must be considered of vast importance by every man, who understands the principles of natural justice, and who, from his heart respects the rights and liberties of the various branches of the great human family.

But, Sir, much as I respect and honor the office which you fill; neither that consideration, nor of your circumstances in life combined therewith, would have been, of themselves, sufficient to call forth this dedication. But when, in one so circumstanced and so honored by his country, I view and contemplate, the genuine *philanthropist*—the *friend of mankind*—the man who is just to the *poor despised negro*—who cheerfully foregoes every advantage or profit which might accrue from a participation in the iniquitous system. A man whose hands have never, either directly or indirectly, been polluted with the crime of slavery—who, to avoid being a participator therein, has submitted to inconve-

niences; and rather than have slaves in his house to administer to his domestic comforts, has occasionally stooped to do those things himself which are generally performed by servants—stoop! did I say; I beg pardon, Sir,—It is this view of you that calls forth my highest admiration. In such conduct and under the influence of such motives, you rise in the scale of human dignity. You thereby display that purity of sentiment, that independence of character, that consistency of mind and action, and that true greatness of soul, which exalt and ennoble human nature. In such situations, and under the influence of such sentiments, you can *look down* with conscious superiority, upon the proudest monarchs and the most haughty nobles of the earth; who in the midst of pomp and pageantry, vainly imagine the rest of mankind made for their accommodation. In such situation too, the oppulent slaveholder has to *look up,* to contemplate that excellency to which *he* cannot aspire: and, while he envies those feelings produced by that rectitude of heart and conduct which *he* has not the virtue to imitate, he must sink in *conscious inferiority* and feel the degradation of his own situation.

It is this view of your character, Sir, separate from all political considerations (for I have not interfered with the politics of the country) that has drawn forth this humble but sincere tribute of respect, and I cannot resist the impulse of my soul, to embrace this opportunity publicly to testify, how much I honor and venerate the man, who, exalted in public station, and in circumstances above the mass of the people, has the virtue and integrity, to resist the temptations of profit and interest; and who, by example shines as a light in the midst of the contaminating thousands that surround him.

But, Sir, that my motives in thus addressing you may not be misconstrued, and that I may at once silence any injurious insinuations, permit me frankly to state, that, while I pay this tribute to your exalted virtue and uniform consistency, as the friend of liberty; mine is not the language of flattery or sycophancy. Believe me, Sir, I am actuated by no interested motives—I ask no favor—I seek no situation. It is not as the dispenser of places, but as the friend of *justice, humanity and of man* that I address you. My pen shall never be prostituted to aggrandize myself. Had I been capable of doing this, I might have done it with better effect, in another country, where talent and sycophancy combined, seldom pass unnoticed or unrewarded. Dispense to others as you please, or s your judgment dictates; all I wish or desire is, that you may continue the stanch friend of human liberty—an advocate for the equal rights of all men of every hue; and that you may, at no very distant period, find the benevolent wishes of your soul completely crowned.

With these feelings and motives, I dedicate this work to you.—Accept the tribute I offer. If it contains no other merit, it has that of sincerity. And believe me, Sir, should I see cause, I shall be as ready to censure and condemn in you, any departure from the principles of justice and humanity, as I have now been to praise and commend an adherence to them.

Wishing that your example may be followed by many, I beg leave to subscribe myself,

Sir, Your very humble servant

In the cause of human liberty,

JOHN WRIGHT.

Washington, January 10, 1820.

the edge of those severe remarks is not directed against that writer's sentiments on slavery; it is not aimed at his arguments; but at and against, what no *honest* writer would allow himself in—against, what every lover of TRUTH must disapprove and condemn—against, wilful perversion and misquotation of language, and *intentional* misrepresentation of the design of the writers whom he opposes.—If the charge, which I have brought against this writer, be correct, no one can think me too severe: And should it be incorrect, he has it in his power to repel the charge and transfer it to me: for either the charge is just and substantiated or, I am myself guilty of the thing which I impute to him. —We don't stand before the tribunal of the public; we have to be weighed in the scales of literary justice; one of us must be found wanting; and which ever it be, let infamy rest on his head.

THE AUTHOR.

REFUTATION, &c.

When a writer, in reply to another, comes before the public, on an important subject; whatever may be his station in life; his claim to respect must rest on the strength of his arguments, the correctness of his statements, the fair and honest construction he puts upon his antagonist's language, and the evident motives by which he is actuated.

Had the gentleman, whom I now undertake to refute, adhered to this line of conduct, in his reply to the Edinburgh Reviewers, I should have treated him with that courtesy and respect, to which he would have been entitled. This I would have done, even if his station in life had been on a level with the poorest man in the district: for, in a republican country, all are on a level; the laws know of no distinction; nor will good men know any, save those of talent and virtue. But high as this writer ranks in circumstances, and nearly as he is said to be allied to the first official character in the United States, (for, if I am not incorrectly informed, the pamphlet is the production of one, who is by marriage, nearly related to the President,) neither his circumstances nor his connexions shall screen him from that reproof and exposure which his mis-statements, mis-representations, and mutilated, perverted quotations demand.

I had intended confining my refutation principally to this writer's reasonings and assertions on natural justice and divine revelation; taking it for granted, that, as a fair and honest combatant, he had done no injustice to the writers in question: but having just obtained the LXI. Number of the Edinburgh Review, which contains the remarks against which his strictures are directed; I find that he has grossly, and I think wilfully, perverted the language, and unhandsomely quoted their words in a detached manner; separating them from the connexion in which they stand, to make them express a very different meaning from what they were evidently intended to convey. This induced me to alter, or rather extend my original plan, that, by exposing the conduct of the writer,

I might show what dependence is to be placed on his pretended good will to the Reviewers; and how far he, who, under the mask of politeness and seeming respect, perverts the plain, unequivocal language of his opponent, in order to support a falling, iniquitous system, by enlisting on his side those national feelings and prejudices which he pretends to deprecate, may be considered sincere and correctly honest in his quotations from the scriptures; and how far he, who puts a false gloss on the remarks of his fellow man, ought to be regarded, when he attempts to make the Almighty a party with him in the crime, of which he openly and unblushing avows himself to be guilty.

To a controvertist of this description, I should certainly have paid as little attention, as he professes himself disposed to do to other writers whom he mentions, did I not conceive, that his misrepresentations and false glosses might pass for *just* and *honest* criticisms with those who have not the opportunity of reading the Edinburgh Review for themselves; and did I not also feel convinced, that however inconsistent and sophistical a writer may be, his crafty insinuations, and unrefuted, wilful misconstructions, might make impressions on some, to the procrastination of that event, the consummation of which, must be devoutly wished for by every *good* man. And as I have before taken up my pen in defence of the unalienable rights of man, I consider myself bound, at this very important juncture, to step forward again, and in the face of this country, and of the world, oppose every attempt to rivet the chains of our fellow-men, and perpetuate that state of degradation into which, not their own misconduct, but the avarice, injustice, and oppression of others have plunged them: and to do all I can to aid the genuine friends of humanity in their benevolent exertions to drive the *lingering* foe from his last refuge; and in ushering in that morn which shall hail the unfortunate African as a "MAN and a BROTHER."

There is, in the literary world, a kind of retributive justice, which fails not to overtake, and that speedily, the transgressor. And he, who, wilfully or wantonly injures his opponent, must not expect to escape *that* tribunal. The motley robe which he makes for, and arrays his antagonist in, will prove combustible, and the fame of its inventor will be consumed in its flames. The consequences of the false statement, and unjust censure brought against the Edinburgh Reviewers, must fall upon this writers's own head. A discerning public will judge between him and them, and pronounce correctly on the merits or demerits of each.

That a man of the writer's rank in society, and of his abilities and acquired advantages, should read the plain, unambiguous language of the Reviewers, and not *understand* it,

is not only *improbable*, but *impossible*. That he should both read and understand it, and yet pervert and misrepresent its design, must, at once raise our astonishment and contempt, and cannot fail to sink his fame, and degrade him in the literary circles. That this writer has not gone on *hearsay* evidence, but has *read* for himself, we may gather from his own publication. And that he has perverted, *wilfully* perverted, what he has read, may be fully demonstrated by a fair comparison of the Reviewer's own language, and his mutilated quotations.

He has attempted to inflame the minds of the "American people," to call forth their worst feelings, and thereby to lead them from the criminal features of slavery; that by raising their indignation against the Reviewers, who have protested against the inhuman system; he may ensnare their judgment, and make them vulnerable to those impressions which his craft and sophistry, in defence of the system, is calculated to make on those, whose discernment and thinking faculties, are suspended by their passions and resentments.

This writer has, *page* 3, charged the Reviewers with characterizing "the American people, as *vulgar and gasconading:*" and he has kept up, and reiterated the charge through the different parts of his pamphlet, frequently introducing the words with *quotation marks;* and in the page alluded to, he has marked it thus, "vulgar and gasconading," as if it were a literal and correct quotation of the Reviewers' own words. As this phrase does not occur in the Review: as they have neither used the sentence, nor any that can convey such an idea, but have expressed themselves in language just the reverse: I ask this writer, upon what rule of *fair* criticism, or on what principle of *honor* or *common honesty*, he has *fabricated* the sentence; put it into the mouth of the Reviewers; and by his quotation marks, told the "American People," that the *Reviewers* had used it?

The only place in the review of the books alluded to, where both the above words occur in a sentence, runs thus: (for the sake of connexion I will insert the preceding part of the paragraph.)

"*The travellers agree, we think, in complaining of the insubordination of American children,—and do not much like American ladies. In their criticisms upon American gasconade, they forget, that vulgar people of all countries, are full of gasconade.*"

The foregoing is the only paragraph in which the Reviewers have introduced the word "gasconade." Every reader must, at a first glance, be convinced that it neither characterizes the "American People as vulgar," nor as "gasconading:" and *he* must be blind indeed who cannot discern in it, a *defence* of the "American People," against those writers

who so characterize them. And it is with the same design, and in the same sense, that the term "vulgarity" is used a little further on in the same connexion. "The following sample," say they, "of American vulgarity is not uncertaining:" They then give the following extract from Mr. Palmer's Journal: "On arriving at the tavern door, the landlord makes his appearance. *Landlord.* Your servant, gentlemen, this is a fine day. *Answer.* Very fine. *Land.* You've got two *nice creatures*; they are *right elegant* matches. *Ans.* Yes, we bought them for matches. *Land.* They cost a *heap* of dollars, (a pause and knowing look,) 200 I *calculate*. *Ans.* Yes, they cost a good sum. *Land.* Possible! (a pause) going westward to Ohio, gentlemen? *Ans* We are going to Philadelphia. *Land.* Philadelphia! ah, that is a *dreadful* large place, three or four times as big as Lexington. *Ans.* Ten times as large. *Land.* Is it by George! what a mighty *heap* of houses; (a pause) but I *reckon* you was not *reared* in Philadelphia. *Ans.* Philadelphia is not our native place. *Land.* Perhaps *away* up in Canada. *Ans.* No, we are from England. *Land. Is it possible!* well I *calculated* you were from abroad: (a pause) how long have you been from the *old country? Ans.* We left England last March. *Land.* And in August here you are in *Kentuck*. Well I should have *guessed* you had been in the States some years, you speak almost as good English as we do!"

"This dialogue is not a literal copy; but it embraces most of the frequent and improper application of words used in the back country, with a few New England phrases. By the *log-house farmer* and *tavern-keeper* they are used as often, and as erroneously as they occur in the above discourse."

"This," say the Reviewers, "is of course intended as a representation of the manners of the LOW, or at best, the middling class of people of America."

They further represent the four travellers, of whose works they were giving an account, as making extensive tours in every part of America, as well in the old as in the new settlements; "and," say they "generally speaking, we should say their testimony is in favour of American manners. We must except, perhaps, Mr. Fearon; and yet he seems to have very little to say against them."

I have deemed it necessary to make these, and shall make further extracts, to prove, that I have not unjustly, or without cause, charged the writer, whom I have undertaken to refute, with intentionally mis-representing, the language of the Edinburgh Reviewers, and with ascribing to them, feelings and sentiments towards the "American People" which they have never expressed or manifested; which the dullest reader could not infer from their language; and which no writer, but one determined to vilify, could have the front to lay to their charge.

The *assumed* indifference, with which he charges the Reviewers with "levity," in speaking of the "American king;" and of "the price for which, in this country, we hire our Liverpools, Sidmouths and Crokers," may pass with such readers as attend to but one side of the controversy; but those, who read the Review for themselves, as well as this writer's perverted, mutilated extracts, will easily discover, through his cloak of seeming indifference, and expressed intention to "let all these things pass," a deep and unworthy design, in the outset of his pamphlet, to prepossess the American people with an impression, that the Reviewers had treated them and their government with ridicule and contempt. To refute this imputation, as contemptible as it is unfounded, I shall let the Reviewers speak for themselves; and must pity that man's discerning faculties, who cannot see— and detest the baseness of him, who, seeing, misrepresents and denies, that the edge of satire (if satire it can be called) is directed solely against the empty parade, the extravagant expenditure, and exorbitant (and to the people) oppressive salaries of the *British* Government; and that the contrast here drawn between the pay of the high official characters in the one country, and those in the other, is intended as a true encomium on the frugality and economy, and at the same time, efficiency of the American Government. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the Reviewers were addressing a British public, and therefore, in contrasting the comparative expenses of the two governments, they spoke of particular public stations by the names of particular individuals, who, in England, were known to fill those stations. "One of the great advantages," say the Reviewers, "of the American Government, is its cheapness. The American king has about 5000l. per annum, the vice-king 1000l. They hire their Lord Liverpool at about 1000l. per annum, and their Lord Sidmouth (a good bargain) at the same sum. Their Mr. Crokers," (secretaries of the Navy,) "are inexpressibly reasonable. Somewhere about the price of an English door-keeper," (of Parliament, or at court ceremonies,) "or bearer of a mace. Life, however, seems to go on very well, in spite of these low salaries, and the purposes of Government to be fairly answered."

The extracts introduced by the Reviewers from Mr. Hall and Mr. Fearon, certainly convey very different feelings from those of levity or contempt; and the introduction of them, displays the veneration in which the Reviewers hold a station "higher than that of kings." "Mr. Hall made him (Mr. Jefferson) a visit:"

"I slept a night at Monticello, and left it in the morning, with such a feeling as the traveller quits the mouldering remains of a Grecian temple, or the pilgrim a fountain in the de-

sert. It would indeed argue great torpor, both of understanding and heart, to have looked without veneration and interest, on the man who drew up the declaration of American Independence; who shared in the councils by which her freedom was established, whom the unbought voice of his fellow-citizens called to the exercise of a dignity, from which his own moderation impelled him, when such example was most salutary, to withdraw; and who, while he dedicates the evening of his glorious days to the pursuits of science and literature, shuns none of the humbler duties of private life; but, having filled a seat, higher than that of kings, succeeds, with graceful dignity, to that of good neighbor, and becomes the friendly adviser, lawyer, physician, and even gardener, of his vicinity. This is the 'still small voice' of philosophy, deeper and holier than the lightnings and earthquakes which have preceded it. What monarch would venture thus to exhibit himself in the nakedness of humanity? On what royal brow would the laurel replace the diadem."

"Mr. Fearon dined with another of the ex-kings, Mr. Adams." The extract given by the Reviewers, after passing some encomiums on the persons and hospitality of Mr. A. andhis lady; and after describing the plain, but good and plentiful viands which crowned the board, thus concludes:

"The establishment of this political patriarch, consist of a house two stories high, containing, I believe, eight rooms; of two men and three maid servants; three horses and a plain carriage. How great is the contrast between this individual—a man of knowledge and information—without pomp, parade, or vicious and expensive establishments, as compared with the costly trappings, the depraved characters, and the profligate expenditure of ——— house and———————! What a lesson, *in this*, does America teach! There are now in this land, no less than three Cincinati!"

The same injustice has been done to the Reviewer's remarks on slavery; the same perversion of design has been resorted to; the same mutilation of their sentences; the same misconstruction of their words. This writer has ransacked different paragraphs for epithets, torn them from the connexions in which they stood, mixed them with words of his own, brought them together as so many clauses of one sentence, without a single period point to separate them, as if the Reviewers had pronounced them all in one breath, leaving the reader entirely in the dark respecting their original connexion, or the relation of circumstances which occasioned the using of them—circumstances to which they were applied, and to which, even this writer, with all his delicacy and *professed* patriotism, cannot say, they do *not justly* apply. It shall, however, be my business to exhibit both sides to the public; and after stating what this writer says, I will lay before the *American public*,

the remarks of the Reviewers on slavery, with the extracts they have given, in the order and connexion in which they have written them, leaving the unbiassed and discerning to judge between him and them.

Addressing the Reviewers, he says, "You undertake to represent the character of my country, as dishonoured and degraded by a "foul stain"—by "an atrocious crime"—by "feelings and practices amounting to the 'consummation of all wickedness,' and my countrymen themselves as, 'scourgers and murderers of slaves,' and beneath 'the least and lowest of the European nations."

Now let the Reviewers appear in their own dress, and let this "Virginian," who declares himself a *slave holder;* or, to use his own words, "*a participator in that crime*," either *disprove* the facts related, or *prove* that the epithets are not applicable to the cruelties, *legally sanctioned cruelties*, and murders to which the reviewers allude:

"The great curse of America is the institution of slavery —of itself far more than the foulest blot upon their national character, and an evil which counterbalances all the excisemen, licensers, and tax-gatherers of England. No virtuous man ought to trust his own character, or the character of his children, to the demoralizing effects produced by commanding slaves. Justice, gentleness, pity, and humility, soon give way before them. Conscience suspends its functions. The love of command—the impatience of restraint, get the better of every other feeling; and cruelty has no other limit than fear."

The Reviewers then introduce the following extracts from Mr. Jefferson:—"There must, doubtless, (says Mr. Jefferson) be an unhappy influence on the manners of the people, produced by the existence of slavery amongst us. The whole commerce between master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions; the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it: for man is an imitative animal. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves; gives loose to the worst of passions; and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his morals and manners undepraved by such circumstances." Notes, p. 241.

"The following picture," continue the Reviewers: "of a slave song is quoted by Mr. Hall from the Letters on Virginia:

"I took the boat this morning, and crossed the ferry over to Portsmouth, the small town which I told you is opposite to this place. It was court day, and a large crowd of people was gathered about the court-house. I had hardly got upon the steps to look in, when my ears were assailed by the voice

of singing: and turning round to discover from what quarter it came, I saw a group of about thirty negroes, of different sizes and ages, following a rough looking white man, who sat carelessly lolling in his sulky. They had just turned round the corner, and were coming up the main-street to pass by the spot where I stood, on their way out of town. As they came nearer I saw some of them loaded with chains to prevent their escape: while others had hold of each other's hands, strongly grasped, as if to support themselves in their affliction. I particularly noticed a poor mother, with an infant sucking at her breast as she walked along, while two small children had hold of her apron on either side, almost running to keep up with the rest. They came along singing a little wild hymn, of sweet and mournful melody, flying, by a divine instinct of the heart, to the consolation of religion, the last refuge of the unhappy, to support them in their distress. The sulky now stopped before the tavern, at a little distance beyond the court-house, and the driver got out. "My dear Sir," said I to a person who stood near me, "can you tell me what these poor people have been doing? What is their crime? And what is to be their punishment? O, said he, it is nothing at all, but a parcel of negroes sold to Carolina; and that man is their driver, who has bought them. But what have they done, that they should be sold into banishment? Done, said he, nothing at all that I know of: their masters wanted money, I suppose, and these drivers give good prices.—Here the driver having supplied himself with brandy, and his horse with water, (the poor negroes of course wanted nothing,) stepped into his chair again, cracked his whip, and drove on, while the miserable exiles followed in funeral procession behind him."

The Reviewers continue, "The law by which slaves are governed in the Carolinas is a provincial law, as old as 1740, but made perpetual in 1783. By this law it is enacted, that every negro shall be presumed a slave, unless the contrary appear. The ninth clause allows two Justices of the Peace, and three freeholders, *power to put them to any manner of death:* the evidence against them may be *without oath.* No slave is to traffic on his own account. Any person *murdering a slave* is to pay 100l. or 14l. if he *cuts out the tongue of a slave. Any white man* meeting seven slaves together on a high road, may give them *twenty lashes each.* No man must *teach a slave to write*, under penalty of 100l. currency. We have Mr. Hall's authority for the existence and enforcement of this law at the present day. Mr. Fearon has recorded some facts still more instructive:

"Observing a great many coloured people, particularly females, in these boats, I concluded that they were emigrants, who had proceeded thus far on their rout towards a settlement. The fact proved to be, that fourteen of the flats were freighted

with human beings for sale. They had been collected in the several states by slave-dealers, and shipped from Kentucky for a market. They were dressed up to the best advantage, on the same principle that jockeys do horses upon sale: (an advertisement from Mr. Fearon is here introduced; then follows another extract from the same.)

"The three 'African Churches,' as they are called, are for all those native Americans who are black, or have any shade of colour, darker than white. These persons, though many of them are possessed of the rights of citizenship, are not admitted into the churches visited by whites. There exists a penal law, *deep written in the minds of the whole white population*, which subjects their coloured fellow-citizens to unconditional contumely, and never-ceasing insult. No respectability, however unquestionable,—no property, however large,—no character, however, unblemished, will gain a man, whose body is (in American estimation,) *cursed* with even a twentieth portion of the blood of his African ancestry, admission into society!!! They are considered as mere pariahs—as outcasts and vagrants upon the face of the earth! I make no reflection upon these things, but leave the facts for your consideration." *Fearon.*

The Reviewers then proceed thus,

"That such feelings and such practices should exist among men who know the value of liberty, and profess to understand its principles, is the consummation of wickedness. Every American who loves his country, should dedicate his whole life, and every faculty of his soul, to efface this foul stain from its character! If nations rank according to their wisdom and their virtue, what right has the American, a scourger and murderer of slaves, to compare himself with the least and lowest of the European nations?—much more with this great and humane country, where the greatest lord dare not lay a finger on the meanest peasant? What is freedom, where all are not free: where the greatest of God's blessings are limited, with impious caprice, to the colour of the body? And these are the men who taunt the English with their corrupt Parliament, with their buying and selling votes. Let the world judge which is the most liable to censure—We who, in the midst of our rottenness, have torn off the manacles of slaves all over the world;—or they who, with their idle purity, and useless perfection, have remained mute and careless, while groans echoed and whips clank'd round the very walls of their spotless Congress. We wish well to America—we rejoice in her prosperity—and are delighted to resist the absurd impertinence with which the character of her people is often treated in this country. But the existence of slavery in America is an atrocious crime, with which no measures can be kept—for which her situation affords no sort of apolo-

gy—which makes liberty itself distrusted, and the boast of it disgusting."

Having given these extracts, I shall, before I enter upon a critical examination of them, give another proof of the unfair conduct of the Author of the "Letter to the Edinburgh Reviewers." I have before charged him, not only with *wilful perversion* of the Reviewers' language; but likewise with *compiling sentences*, of words torn from their respective connexions, and marking them with quotation marks, as though they were *literally* and *correctly* quoted from the Review, in the form and order in which they occur in that work: And I again charge him with the same dishonorable conduct. At page 50, he has the following pretended extract, "Wickedness, with which no measures are to be kept." And at page 28, "The least and lowest in rank and character," and in various other places he has taken the same unwarrantable liberty—I ask this writer whether, in the face of this charge, he dare come before the public, and say he has acted fairly and justly towards the Reviewers? Dare he assert, that those sentences and many others, which he has marked as quotations, were in the form in which he has given them, used by the Reviewers? He dares not. How then did he dare, in his pamphlet, to come before the American public with an *untruth* in his mouth? How dare he thus to insult the American public, and treat them as a credulous people, which might be imposed upon at the pleasure of any crafty designing writer? What literary man of *honour* and *integrity* would do this? Is it possible that he could persuade himself, that no reader would be found, who would compare his garbled extracts with the originals from whence he tore them?—What credit are we to give, to the *professed* purity of motive and *proclaimed* patriotism of a writer, who thus detaches the words of an opponent from their respective connexions and sentences, and with these broken materials, manufacture a sentence, to *answer his own purpose*; and then, by his quotation marks, tell the public, that he has given it just as he found it in its original form and state? There is always cause to suspect that writer's motives, who wilfully perverts, mistates, and misquotes the language of those against whom he writes It is a maxim, as true in the literary, as in the political world, that he who is *not just to an enemy, will not be true to his own Country*, any further than *his own interest is concerned*. "The Virginian" writer may make what applications of this he please: for my own part, I do not hesitate to express my conviction—a conviction, produced by his unfair and unjust conduct towards the Reviewers, that if himself had not been a *slave-holder*, "a participator in that crime" and *connected with a family* belonging to one of the *slave-holding states*," and "who are *themselves the owners of slaves*;" his Letter to the E. Reviewers would not

have appeared: but their remarks on slavery, might have been "read from the Ganges to the Missouri" without his feeling any concern.—But I come now to a critical examination of their remarks, as contained in the extracts already given.

"The institution of slavery—of itself far more than the foulest blot on their national character." Let the reader keep in mind the narrative given of the existence and practical operation of an *internal slave trade*, with all the horrors of *families dismembered and forever separated*—of the "atrocious" Law in the Carolinas, which makes the *murder of a slave*, no greater crime than the *teaching him to write*; and the *cutting out of the tongue of a slave*, a very trifling offence; nearly on an equality with keeping a dog without a license;—together with the other cruelties authorized by that Law; the *still* existence of which, the "Virginian" does not attempt to deny; let the reader, I say, keep these things in mind, and I am sure he will, with the Reviewers, think the existence of slavery, a foul blot on the national character; and I ask this writer, whether, under *this* view of it, *he* will say it is *no blot?* or whether *he* can point out any other blot on the character of this country, which equals, or which can bear any comparison with it? If he cannot, then the Reviewers are correct; for they only compared it with other blots, if blots there be, on the national character of *this country*, and pronounced it, "of itself far more than the foulest" of them all.

This in the principal epithet in their first paragraph on slavery.—They indeed call it a "curse;" and their opponent admits it to be one—They speak also of its demoralizing influence, this I shall attend to hereafter. At present, I have to do with the epithets, and to what they are applied: I must therefore pass on to the last paragraph of their remarks on slavery. And here it is evident to every discerning reader, and must have been evident to our "Virginian" writer, that the remarks were made, in consequence of, and applied to, what is related in the extracts which preceded them. And the epithets which that paragraph contains, are directly applied to *those* practises and statutes there recited: for they immediately remark, with sentiments of grief and honest indignation; "That such feelings and such sentiments should exist *among men who know the value of liberty, and profess to understand its principles*, is the consummation of wickedness," and they then make that appeal to "every American wholoves his country," which I before recited.—"*Such* feelings" *Such* practices." What feelings and what practices are here intended? To what does the word "*Such*" relate? What are its antecedents? Has our *honest* defender of slavery attended to this, when he collected and jumbled the epithets together? No; he has given us no intimation of any connexion between those epithets and the circumstances related; he well knew,

that so doing would have defeated his own end: and, instead of convincing the American people, that the Reviewers had "insulted and abused" them: it would have blunted the edge of his attack, and convinced the public, that he was abusing the Reviewers.

This "Virginian" writer could not possibly read the Review without feeling convinced, and *every* reader of the Review must be convinced, that by the terms, "*such* feelings and *such* practices," the Reviewers intended, those things which were related in the extracts which they had just given, viz. the abominable, *internal traffic* in slaves, the selling them, and the conveying of them to be re-sold in droves, *chained together*, like cattle from one place to another, and from one state: one *sovereign, independent state*, to another *sovereign, independent state*, each of which possesses the power of abolishing such traffic, and such introduction or removal, respectively—the cruel scourging of slaves so commonly practised, and that under the sanction of the Laws, which permit, not only the owner, but even a stranger, who meets seven men of colour on the highway, to inflict it on each of them—the cruel mangling of slaves, which the Law does not prohibit effectually, and which is too often practised. The murder of slaves, which often happens, and the perpetrators escape with impunity, or with only paying a paltry fine—that impious pride; that arrogant, unchristian feeling, which obtrudes itself into the very temple of God, against which the sanctuary of the most high is not proof, and to which the worship of the dread Eternal presents no barrier; but, under the influence of such feelings, the hypocritical devotee, separates from his brother worm of the earth, because his skin is not the colour of his own, and, in the haughtiness of his heart, directs him, either to another distinct building, or to a completely distinct, separate part of the same building; exclaiming, by his conduct and carriage, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me: for I am holier than thou." And concerning which, the Lord hath declared "These are a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day" and against whom he has threatened "I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom." Every reader of the Review, I repeat it, must admit that it was under the impressions, the horrible impressions, made by these facts, that the Reviewers denounced the existence of "such feelings and such practices *among* men enjoying more real liberty than any other people on the globe, as "the consummation of wickedness:" and that persons who are guilty, either of practising these things themselves, or of sanctioning them in others, are "Scourgers and murderers of slaves:" for it would be childish to contend, that *beating* or *whipping* is not *scourging*: or that *killing* is not *murder*. And as those who

allow these things, share in the crime and guilt, the epithets will apply to all who do not use every means in their power to prevent such enormities. And surely it will be admitted, that any "American," who *is* "a scourger and murderer of slaves" is as low as any character, in any nation whatever, and it is to such characters that the Reviewers address themselves when they ask, what right he, a "scourger and murderer of slaves," has "to compare himself with the least and lowest, &c.

That the atrocious law in the Carolinas, is still in existence, our Virginian defender of slavery does not deny: and for the enforcement thereof, even in the present day, we have Mr. Hall's testimony: which testimony, this writer has not dared to controvert —That the statements, given in the Review, are not exaggerated, but that, even greater cruelties are still practised: and that slavery exists in a more horrible shape, and to a more enormous degree, than the Reviewers have described; and remain as a stain, the foulest of the foul, not only on the slaveholders, but also on the respective governments of the slave States; and even attaches itself, in too great a degree, to the general government of the United States, it is now my painful duty to demonstate—I say *painful;* for he who can read what I shall relate, and not heave a sigh and feel a pang, however he may have been familiarized to such things, must be in a very different frame of mind from what I am in, while I pen them. Painful however as the task may be, duty impels me to perform it; and if the recital do but lead to the curtailing of *some* of the miseries of this despised and oppressed branch of the human family, by calling the attention of those to the subject, who are known to "have power to save," *at least in this district;* and if, in any measure, it should stimulate them to "raise their strong hand" and to lop off some of the branches of their hard treatment, I shall have my reward.

Our Virginian writer, having given *page* 43, an extract from a Clergyman's account of his tour through South Carolina, is desirous (according to his note at the foot of the page) that it should be considered as a refutation, of what Mr. Fearon had said, respecting the non-admission of free blacks among whites, into places of worship. I cannot however suffer him to triumph, or to shout victory in this instance: nor can I admit, that this writer *himself*, thought it a refutation. He *must* have known, what no resident in the slave States can be a stranger to, *viz:* That Mr. Fearon's remarks on that head, are, when generally applied, strictly correct. Where, in the slave States, is there a church of any religious denomination (I do not include the Quakers) in which whites and coloured people meet on an equality in the presence of their common Father, and mingle together as *his equal children?* In most great towns and cities, there are distinct, separate churches

for them: and where there are not, the churches are generally so divided into parts, that the people of colour are completely excluded from the whites, and have a separate way of entering the place: not being suffered to enter or depart the same way as the rest; and even the extract from the clergyman's tour mentions "places in the church set apart for them." In this district (Columbia,) the odious distinction is in full force, and very general. In this district, I say, the seat of the general government, the only tract in the Union which the Constitution has placed solely under the government of Congress. In this district, there are places of worship appropriated to people of colour, and there are others, from which they are totally excluded; and, in almost all the churches, belonging to the different religious denominations, they are completely separated from the whites. The colored people feel, deeply feel, this degradation. I was myself much pained one day last summer with an instance of the humiliating state, to which they are reduced. It was about the middle of a week, when a *free man* of colour, a *proprietor of houses and land;* and who was well known to be in *respectable circumstances;* but who had the misfortune to have his skin a little tainted with the blood of his African ancestry, called on me at my house, and addressed me, in substance, as follows.

"Sir, I hope you will pardon my presumption, but I have heard that you are friendly to our people, and that you consider us, and men of your own colour, as all equal in the sight of God; I have therefore a desire, sometimes to attend on your preaching, if you think it *can be allowed;* I however, could not think of *insulting*, either you or your congregation, by coming into your place *without your leave*, as I understand you have no part *set aside for us in particular;* but if you can grant me permission, to sit or stand by the *side of one of the walls*, it will give me great pleasure; and I promise you, I will keep as much *apart* from the congregation as possible."

"Good God" said I to myself "is this the situation, to which worms of the earth reduce their fellow worms?" How dwells the love of God in such?"—And yet, the situation in which this man felt himself, notwithstanding his property, is the very situation, in which, all the people of colour feel themselves, whether they be "*bond or free*," rich or poor, moral or immoral; and as this writer (connected as *he* is) can be no stranger to the state of this district, let him come forward, and disprove what I say if he can; let him point out, *what* places of worship, *through the whole district, where whites attend*, are free from those odious distinctions and exclusions. Is it the case with the church facing the President's house, called St. John's? Let him also prove, by citing cases, that "respectability however unquestionable"—"property, however large"—or "character, however unblemished," will gain a man, whose

body is (in American estimation) *cursed* with even a twentieth portion of the blood of his African ancestry, admission into society." This writer cannot do this. He knows that such odious distinctions exist. He, and the American people know, how deeply those feelings are rooted. They know, that they carry them with them into the house of God, and even to the foot of his awful throne. Would to God they would *there* recollect those feelings, with that compunction, contrition, and *self*-abhorrence, which become vile, sinful creatures, when they approach and address the great, equal Father of all, who "is no respecter of persons."

The slave system, in this country, is of that dark and oppressive nature, that it is very difficult, at all times, to bring to legal light, the works of darkness and villany which it embraces and produces. There are many cruelties exercised upon the poor slaves—many inhuman scourgings and horrid murders perpetrated, without such atrocities being generally known, or coming fairly and fully before the public; and if known publicly, without the perpetrators being brought to punishment; even, where the law has made it criminal. From the situations in which the slave laws have placed the owners and slaves respectively, this must necessarily be the case. The owner of slaves, as a late writer remarks, is, within his plantation or on his estate, an absolute sovereign. He possesses more power than the most despotic of kings. He can punish at pleasure; and if, in some cases, restricted by laws, as to the number of stripes that may be inflicted at one time; who can prevent his repeating the same, under any frivolous pretence, the next day or even the next hour? or who can prevent his violating the provisions of the law in that respect? Generally, the slaves are punished at the will of their owner or overseer, as passion or caprice may dictate; and if whipped to death, which often happens, or murdered in any other way, when none but slaves, or the instruments of his cruelty are present, who is to be evidence against the murderer? for though an hundred slaves may witness the "foul" deed, not one of them can be admitted an evidence in a court of justice; slaves being by law disqualified from making oath or bearing legal testimony, in any case whatever. But notwithstanding all these difficulties, enough has transpired; enough is publicly known, and enough has been substantiated, to mark the slave system, as a system of *crime*, of *violence* and of *blood*, and to prove that *scourging and murder*, *cruelty and vice*, are its too prominent features.

It is not necessary to crowd these pages, with a multiplicity of cases, in proof of my assertions, as I may probably, at no very distant time, give to the public and the world, a circumstantial history of American slavery, with a detail of the various *cruelties*, *crimes*, and *vices*, which have marked its progress, from its introduction down to the present day:

Suffice it for the present, that I insert such evidence as will justify the Reviewers in the indignant tone in which they expressed themselves; refute our Virginian's attempt to justify the system, and impress the reader, with the odiousness of its features, and the injustice and cruelty that is interwoven with it—I will begin with the Carolinas—The seat of slavery, and according to the Virginian writer, the residence of slaveholders, distinguished for their *humanity*, *morality*, and *religious* conduct.

In those states, it is not uncommon to *brand* their slaves. This the gentleman may call *humane*, *moral* and *religious* if he please: perhaps he may attempt to *justify* it from *sacred scripture*, and tell us, that of this, "no direct *notice* is taken by the founder of the Christian religion" and then triumphantly demand; "What! do the Christians of the present day pretend to be wiser than God Almighty—more merciful than Christ—more humane, more pious, more conscientious, more moral, than the Apostles! Let them beware! Let them not consider their *erring humanity*, as a better guide than their religion!" Or perhaps he may be disposed to deny the existence of this cruelty. From such denial, I will appeal to the evidence of the Charleston Newspaper, where, in the slave advertisements, such phrases as "He has my brand on him;" or "He is marked with my brand" frequently occur. But the "selection of South Carolina" (or both the Carolinas) "was unfortunate for your" (the Reviewers) "theory of morals." Let us however state a fact respecting each in addition to that already stated, and then see how far the Reviewers were "unfortunate in their selections:" and how far the *Old Law* still serves as a protection for cruelty and murder. It *stands on record*, and now lies before me, that in North Carolina, about three or four years before the Reviewers made those remarks, which so much alarmed our Virginian; a slave was flogged to death while his owner stood looking on, enjoying the sight: and himself not satisfied with the tool of his tyranny relinquishing the task, as *he thought too soon*, was about succeeding him in this *work of humanity, morality*, and *religion*, when he discovered, that death had snatched his victim from his tormentors. So far the record of *this cruelty*: but where is the record of the perpetrators of it, *being punished?* Where is the account of "*blood for blood?*" Hush! whisper not that inquiry! Breathe not an interrogatory which would imply, *or* "represent the character of my country as dishonored and degraded by a *foul* stain—by an atrocious crime!"—This however was in *North*, not *South* Carolina—well, what of South Carolina? What! why enough to justify the Reviewers, and ought to have been enough to have silenced their opponent on that head.

The instance of cruelty I am about to give, was published in the Charleston Courier, of June 5, 1819. It was per-

petrated in May last; consequently, *five months after the Review was published.* It was sent to the Charleston paper for insertion, by Mr. Faux, a gentleman with whom I am well acquainted, and from whose lips I have received a confirmation of the account, with its horrible particulars. Mr. F. is a gentleman, who, in England, was ever ready to denounce West Indian Slavery; who raised his voice against the corruptions of the British Government; who was never blind to the oppression of his countrymen; nor backward in protesting against it; who came to this country, to use his own expression, "with every fond prejudice and predeliction"—to "America the land of his adored Washington"—"an asylum for the distressed and oppressed of all other lands."—From a gentleman who came out with these prepossessions in favour of this country, was the following account sent to the public Journal. He states, that on his way to that City, from a tour through the interior of the state, 20 miles west of Columbia, he was suddenly attracted to a spot of earth, over which a respectable company of citizens were deeply intent, on witnessing the exhumation of a Negro, whom, one Kelly, his owner, and three others, had tied to a tree at midnight, and each, in turn, continued to whip till sun rise, when, from incessant lashing, his bowels gushed out, and he expired, and was instantly buried in a private corner, on May 23d. Mr. F's Letter gave such publicity to this atrocious act, that some noise and some inquiry was made: but the *issue* of that inquiry is *not made public.* And I challenge this writer to prove, that Kelly and his accomplices were treated and *punished as murderers.*

But "it well becomes" us "and every friend of justice, to hear and to know," that the writer, whom I undertake to refute, "is a Virginian," and may, in reply say "I speak now for Virginia only." Well, let him retreat from Carolina in the best order he can; and I will pursue him into his own immaculate state.

The following extracts are copied from the public prints of June 1818.

"In Augusta county, Virginia, a man sometime since, took a coloured Boy, about 17 years of age, his slave, for the most trifling offence, bound him across a barrel, and scourged him until his life appeared extinguished; after lingering a few hours, he was buried in a hole under a fence in the field; no notice was taken of the murder, and the *Negro Killer,* retained his *public office.*"

"A slave ranaway from a man in Augusta county, Virginia; he was pursued and caught; the man tied the slave to a beam in an old out-house, and flogged him with a large waggon whip, until two physicians, who had been told of the circumstance, entered, and assured the slave tyrant, that a

few more strokes would extinguish his life; in this situation, after being released, he was driven more than 20 miles, to the slave-holder's plantation."

"A man in Powhatan County, Virginia, laid his slave across a fence, on a Court-day, near the Court House; balanced him by one rock tied to his neck and another to his feet. In this situation he battered him to death. The Negro Killer, though it was done before the county assembled, received no other animadversion that a volley of oaths."

I have selected the foregoing instances of cruelty, which have already been before the public, in preference to new cases; they having been well substantiated; but they are by no means singular cases. Such things so frequently occur, that it would not be difficult to produce a long catalogue of them, with dates, names, places, and well authenticated testimonies, in proof of their reality; and this will be done, should such catalogue be called for by the system supporters. Indeed so many cruelties have been exercised on the Negroes; so many instances of hard treatment; of injustice and inhumanity have occured, and can be clearly and fully substanciated, that were all recorded which have taken place in the United States, such records would cover a large portion of the state of Virginia.

This writer expatiates upon the *humane* treatment of slaves, and talks of their comforts, their fishing tackle, game traps, dogs, &c. But what are the comforts of the far greater part of them, even in Virginia? Are they not served with food of the coarsest quality, just as if they were horses or other brute animals; and in quantity, just sufficient to preserve life and prepare them for labour? The leading maxim being to ascertain, how the greatest portion of labour may be extorted from them at the smallest possible expense: and as to any comforts beyond a bare support of life, those must be procured by themselves with much difficulty and application. Any thing beyond Indian corn and salt fish, such as fresh fish, fowl, &c. of which this writer so much boasts, must be acquired, at the expence of those hours which should be devoted to rest, and which wearied nature requires to prepare them for the toil of the succeeding day: and it is only in particular situations, that the slaves enjoy these advantages; it is far from being the common lot; nor does this writer pretend it is the case, save "in a well regulated plantation:" And as to their dogs; a late Law in South Carolina has completely denied them, and even all freemen of colour, whatever may be their property, the enjoyment of that faithful and serviceable companion (see the Ordinance, passed at Charleston, June 22, 1819.) In Virginia, the treatment of Negroes is frequently harsh and unfeeling. I have this day been informed by a Gentleman, a resident in this City, on whose veracity I can depend, and whose word, none who know him would dispute.

He has informed me, that on travelling through Virginia 10 years since, during the time he spent at different places he was every morning roused from his sleep, by the clanking of the cow hide, and the screams of the Negroes on whom it was used. The statement of this gentleman can be confirmed by the testimony of many respectable residents in this City, who have been in different parts of Virginia.

The Virginian writer makes great outcry against the immorality and indecency of the Registry Bill; though, the evident design of the obnoxious clause, respecting a triennial examination, was to identify the persons, then slaves, and effectually to prevent the introduction of fresh ones. I do not defend that clause, it may or may not be defensible: but, I think, this writer, before he condemned it, as immoral and indecent, should have made it appear that it is not common, during hot weather, in the West Indies, for slaves to appear openly, in a state of nudity. He ought also to have looked nigher home, lest that phrase, "Thou hypocrite! first cast out the beam out of thine own eye," should be applied to him. I have the authority of the Gentleman just mentioned, to state, that when he passed through Virginia, he frequently saw Negroes, 10 or 12 years of age, completely in a nude state, and that it was not unfrequent for them in this state, to wait on company and be in the presence of ladies, &c. I well recollect, that about 16 or 17 years since, I received similar information, from two gentlemen, just arrived at Liverpool from America; a Mr. Hardisty (now residing at Baltimore) and a Mr. Briggs. These Gentlemen stated, that, even in very genteel families, and in the presence of well dressed ladies, Negroes appeared in this state of nudity, and that no more regard was paid to the state they were in, than there was to the presence of a dog, or any brute animal. This is degredation with a witness!! A question however arises, whether the poor slave, who thus appears, or his pampered owner, who suffers it, is the lower sunk in degradation. Does the clause in the Registry Act, exceed this? or can it even be considered as a justification of this Virginian immodesty? I leave our Virginian writer to answer these questions.

Our author talks much of the exertions made in Virginia, whilst a Colony of Great Britain, to prevent the importation of slaves into the State, and the readiness of that State to suppress that inhuman traffic. Of the purity of their motives, and the extent of their humanity, I shall speak hereafter; at present I ask the Gentleman whether he be prepared to prove, that an *internal slave trade* does not exist to a very extensive degree, both, between the different States (including his own *humane* and immaculate State of Virginia) and between the individuals in different parts of the same State? I think, we ought not to deal in ambiguity on this business; we ought to have no reservation or covered meaning. If this writer and

myself wish the truth to appear without respect of persons or nations, we ought to meet the subject freely and openly. I feel myself disposed to do it; and the public has a right to expect that this writer will do so too. Let him then say, candidly and without evasion, whether it be or be not true, that an *internal slave traffic* is carried on, under the sanction of the Laws, to a very great extent? Are not human beings bought and sold, bartered and transferred, like brute animals? Do they not pass from one to another the same as goods and chattels? Are not families rent to pieces and forever separated? The dearest ties of relationship violently cut asunder? Husbands sold, sent off and banished from their wives, and wives from their husbands? Children of all ages, and either sex, torn from their doting parents, and forever exiled from them and their natal shed? Parents torn from their children and sold to a distant State; while their hapless children are kept in bondage by their inhuman owner? Are not *large droves* of Negroes and Mulattoes, composed of dismembered families, annually bought up by men, who make it their business, to deal "in the souls and bodies of men" women and children, and marched by them from State to State; from clime to clime; sometimes for several hundred miles in fetters (either iron or rope) to a new market, where they undergo another separation, and are resold to the best bidder? Are not the Streets of this Federal City; the Metropolis of this Land of Freedom, frequently infested and disgraced with such disgusting spectacles? Do not *droves* of *manicled* slaves pass the present Mansion of this writer's Relative, the Presidents House, and even the Capitol itself? Is not the great Council of the Nation, and the Temple of Independence and Liberty, insulted with such scenes, and the Representatives of the Country pested with the sight of bands of *fettered Slaves*, while they enter, or retreat from, the Edifice Sacred to the business of a free and independent nation? Do not such scenes occur, even on the Sabbath day? I have a right to expect, and the public and the world demand of this Virginian, that he fairly and fully meet these questions and return unevasive answers. Let him say whether these questions admit of any other than affirmative answers? I assure the Gentleman, I shall let no evasive answer pass unscrutinized: and I am fully convinced, that he dares not so far insult the public, on a subject with which they are so well acquainted, as to give negative answers to the foregoing Queries. The Gentleman will do well to keep in mind, that the Atlantic does not intervene between him and me, as between him and the Reviewers; therefore he must not hug himself in fancied security, and expect to escape with impunity. I am on the spot, and possess both the will and the power to stick close to him, and to keep him to the true point. And I require him, either to admit, that such abominable and atrocious traffic does exist;

or to come forward, and openly, and unequivocally, deny its existence.

Perhaps he may say to me, as he said to the Reviewers, "The affirmation being yours, the burden of proof lies on you. Bring your evidence, exibiting *facts occurring here.*" With such demand, I might comply, to a much greater extent than he desires, or than is necessary to my present purpose. If however he require facts, let him read Dr. Jesse Torrey's Picture of Domestic Slavery, he will there find facts recorded of which that writer was an eye witness, or which he has well substantiated by the testimony of others. Especially, let him read the scene which that gentleman witnessed "on the 4th of December, 1815 (the day on which the Sess on of Congress commenced) on that auspicious morning, while the members were entering the Hall, and close to the old Capitol, within view from the Hall itself; a drove passed, or as that gentleman calls them "a procession of men, women, and children, resembling that of a funeral;" to which he approached so near, as to discover that they were bound together in pairs, some with ropes and some with *iron chains.*" This statement of Mr. Torrey's was confirmed to me last week, by a gentleman, residing in Georgetown, with whom I am well acquainted, and who assured me that he was himself an eye witness of the disgusting procession. It is unnecessary to be thus particular in proving what is as well known and understood, as "that day after day the sun shines." Such occurrences are so common in this district, and in the metropolis, that no one can question its authenticity: it is therefore for the sake of readers in *another* country, that I shall insert Judge Morrel's remarks on this subject, as given by Mr. Torrey.

"Judge Morrell, in a charge to the grand jury of Washington, at the session of the circuit court of the United States, in January 1816, for the district of Columbia, urged this subject to its attention, very emphatically, as an object of remonstrance, and juridical investigation. *He said, the frequency with which the streets of the city had been crowded with manacled slaves, sometimes even on the Sabbath, could not fail to shock the feelings of all humane persons; that it was repugnant to the spirit of our political institutions, and the rights of man, and he believed was calculated to impair the public morals, by familiarizing scenes of cruelties to the minds of the youth.*"

I shall not enlarge on the subject of jails crowded with these slaves of passage; nor shall I occupy the time of the reader, with a detailed account of the scenes of injustice and inhumanity practised in a house in F street, kept by the noted Millar. I shall not stop to give a picture of the *inside* of that house, with the secret recesses it contained for the concealment of kidnapped persons of colour: nor shall I at *this time,* describe the vast numbers that from time to time, were

kept confined there, in readiness to be sent off to Georgia, on the arrival of the "dealers in human flesh," (previously to its being burnt last year) suffice it, that such a *place and person*, long disgraced this city, the seat of government; and that these things are well known, they having been the subject of legal investigation. I shall pass on to another branch of negro oppression, which calls for speedy redress, and which not only claims the attention of the Virginian writer, but also of the state governments; and, in this part of the Union, the special attention of Congress, and the general government: for it involves the general government in blame. I allude to those laws, which authorize any white man to arrest, as a run-away slave, any coloured man or woman, who cannot produce a certificate of freedom. This, I believe is the case in all the slave States, and is as much so in this district, as in any part of the United States—I wish to speak of the general government with the greatest respect. I would flatter myself, that Congress is not aware of the extent to which these abuses are carried in this district, over which it has the exclusive authority, and the sole power of Legislation. I most earnestly entreat that body to turn its attention to this abuse, and to extend protection to those who have a right, a legal right, to look up to *that* quarter for protection. However its constitutional right to interfere with the *internal slave affairs* of the different States, may be doubted or controverted, there can be no doubt, respecting the extent of its power of interference in the district of Columbia; and yet, in this district, not only slavery exists in all its frightful forms: not only "groans echo, and whips clank round the very walls of Congress;" but persons of colour may be, and are, illegally arrested, and deprived of their liberty. In this district, I say, under the very eyes of government, the constables are upon the look-out for runaway slaves, and they frequently catch *free* men, who have been in the enjoyment of liberty so long, that they have perhaps worn out or lost their certificate of freedom, which if they cannot produce, they are immediately conveyed to jail: There they lie, till their jail fees or expenses, amount to much more than they are able to pay; and they are at last *sold off as slaves*, to defray those fees and expenses: And the Georgia men (as they are called) are always waiting, ready to buy and carry them off. Thus many a poor *free* black, *legally* as much intitled to protection as any other man, is carried off into slavery; and thus, many become rich by the oppressing of those who are *declared* to be "*equally intitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*" Even the very nature and spirit of the laws are reversed when applied to persons of colour in this country. It is a maxim at law, with respect to other persons in this country; and it is also the maxim in every country, governed by laws, that the *proof negative* is never required. In all other cases, save that of blacks, the accuser

has to prove the charge, or to use the language of our Virginian, "*The affirmation being his, the burden of proof lies on him.*" And, according to this general maxim of justice; he who seizes and accuses the negro as a runaway slave, ought to be made to prove his accusation, or the negro should be liberated and fully indemnified at the expense of his accuser. On this principle, the American criminal code stands. On this maxim the courts of justice proceed, and I appeal to our "Virginian," whether, as a *professional man*, he does not adhere to this maxim, in all cases, where he is retained on the part of the defendent. The proof negative is always exploded. It was the requirement of this proof, that the United States so very justly condemned in the English, relative to the seamen of this country; and for this, among other causes, war was declared against England.

Our Virginian writer spurns at the Reviewer's remarks on the demoralizing tendency of slavery, and would persuade us, that no such effects result therefrom. But surely, he either cannot be serious; or he can have been very little in the way of slaves and slave holding families; or he must have been a very superficial observer of what passes and is produced. I have already given the logical and striking remarks of the venerable Jefferson on this subject; and the impressive charge delivered to the grand jury of Washington, by judge Morrel. Dr. Jesse Torrey has detailed what he observed of the effects of slavery on the morals of the people, during his tour through a long tract of slave country. He has clearly demonstrated, that pride, ignorance, indolence, luxury and extravagance, are its very prevalent consequences. To these authorities, of themselves conclusive, I have something more to add. I ask this writer, whether he be a stranger to the vast extent to which an illicit intercourse is carried on between our male youth and female slaves, and even between married men and them? I ask him to account for the great number of illegitimate children of a brighter complexion and thinner features than their mothers? Is he to be informed, that many proprietors of female slaves, greedy of having an increase for sale or labour, are so very accommodating to their male friends and visitors as to give them free access to them? Is he to be told of the number of children, mulatto children, which slaveholders, have born in their own houses, and of which they are the fathers? Or is it necessary to inform him, that such offspring are held in slavery by their fathers, brothers, and other relations? Must I mention a crime against the laws of nature; against the common feelings and the common instinctive affections of man and other animals; a crime which sinks man below the wild animals of the forest. I mean the unnatural practice of white fathers selling their coloured offspring; of breaking one of nature's strongest ties, making

merchandize of the fruit of their own bodies, and of selling them as slaves for life too? Will the gentleman say, that "the least and lowest" individual "of the European nations" ever committed a crime more heinous, or more degrading to human nature than this? Or will he deny the existence, or frequency of this detestable crime? Should he do this, and call for proof; I am prepared to meet his denial with a list, (nor will it be a small one) of cases, where men in this country, and in this district too, have sold their children, their brothers, sisters, and other relations, just the same as they would sell a cow, or a hog: And even of men, who have married their female slaves, and after living with them, till they have borne them several children, *sold both the mother and the offspring together.*

The gentleman will find, that, in the absence of the Reviewers, I have so far answered for them, as to obey his demand, when he says, "Bring your evidence, exhibiting *facts occurring here.*"

And he may now, with as many exclamation notes as he pleases, retort the word, "Demoralizing!" He may spurn, and be as eloquently indignant at the Reviewers for touching on the demoralizing tendency of slavery, as he thinks fit. He may exert all his great talents, and as a first rate pleader, attempt to prove, that darkness is light, and sophistry sound reasoning; but unless he can refute my statements, and disprove the existence of the things I have related; or, admitting them true, strip them of their atrocity, they must stand as damning proofs of the weakness of his arguments, and demonstrate, that what he has said on that head, is but as so much dust, thrown into the eyes of the public, to prevent their viewing slavery, at this momentous crisis, in that hideous deformity which properly belongs to it. I think I may say with more propriety than he, "My business is with the fact, and I repeat that the fact is with me."

We have the testimony of historians, that slavery has always tended to demoralize mankind. That this was the case with ancient Rome, we have ample proof in the accounts given of gladiators, and of *domestic* slavery. "Men called lanistæ, made it their business, to purchase prisoners and slaves, and to have them instructed in the use of the various weapons, and when any Roman chose to amuse the people with their favourite show, or to entertain a select company of his own friends, upon any particular occasion, he applied to the lanistæ, who, for a fixed price, furnished him with as many pairs of those unhappy combatants as he required." Thus, the great body of the people, accustomed to scenes of cruelty, necessarily imbibed a cruelty of disposition, and a delight in the misery and sufferings of their unfortunate fellowmen, and "As these combats formed the supreme plea-

sure of the inhabitants of Rome, the most *cruel* of their emperors, were sometimes the most *popular*; merely because they gratified the people, without restraint, in their favorite amusement." "The practice of *domestic* slavery has influence in rendering the Romans of a cruel character. Masters could punish their slaves in what manner and to what degree, they thought proper. The sound of whips and lashes resounded from every quarter." "This cruel disposition which domestic slavery prevailes exte[illegible] hardened the mild tempers of the [illegible]acture has Juvenal drawn of the toilet of a

> Nam si constituit [illegible]e decentius optat
> Ornari ———— ————
> Componit crinem laceratis ipsa capillis
> Nuda humeros Psecas infelix, nudisque mamillis
> Altior hic quare cincinnus? Taurea punit,
> Continuo flexi crimen facinusque capilli. *

The same causes produce the same effects in all ages and in every country. Slavery, every where is injurious to the morals of the country where it is suffered to exist; and will always engender pride, tyranny, and cruelty, in proportion to the power with which the laws invest the master over the slave. Hence the frequency of masters in this country throwing a slave into jail, without any assigned cause, previously to selling him off; for the laws empower a man to confine his slaves in jail, at any time, whether he has done any act to merit it or not. The gentleman talks largely of the happiness which slaves, in this country, enjoy over the free, poor population of other countries. But would the poorest wretch on earth, who is in possession of freedom, willingly exchange situations with those slaves that are the best treated? The gentleman holds a language on this subject, very similar to what is held by all oppressors, respecting the victims of their oppression. This was the kind of language used by the ex-colonists of St. Domingo; and the reply given to such by that able negro writer, the Baron De Vastey, will equally apply on the present occasion, and is worthy the attention of this Virginian; for it is quite to the point.

"Whom do they hope to persuade that slavery is a blessing? Is it us who have experienced all its horrors? If their declarations be sincere, why not put themselves in our place? their *example* will have a far more powerful effect, than all the absurd reasoning they can employ."

The Virginian urges the danger of agitating the question: and yet, *he* has brought the subject, a hundred times

* But if she has made an assignation and wishes to be drest in more than usual stile.—Poor Psecas (her female slave) with her hair torn about her ears, and stripped to the waist, adjusts the locks of her mistress. WHY IS THIS CURL SO HIGH? Presently the whip punishes the disorder of the least hair.

more to the notice of the American public, and a thousand times more to the attention of the negroes than the Reviewers either have done or can do. He has done more.—He has put on armour, composed of *polished* glass, and in these brittle, transparent accoutrements, he has dared to throw down the gauntlet; he has provoked discussion, and he must now take the consequence of his Quixottic attack.

He warns us of the consequences that would attend a total emancipation, and holds up Hayti" (St. Domingo) as an example, a terrible example, that ought to deter us from putting the white population in such jeopardy. This may indeed serve as a bug-bear, to frighten those who are unacquainted with the true causes, which urged on the coloured population of that island, to take such awful vengeance on their white butchers: but those who are acquainted therewith, will entertain no such fears from what happened there. It was not emancipation that produced those terrible events; but the vile attempt to reduce them again to slavery, after they had been *years* emancipated; nor was the vengeance of the blacks marked with half the cruelty that had just before been exercised upon them, by the *moral, humane, religious*, whites, who had commenced the massacres, and, as I shall in the sequel show, carried them to a length, the recital of which, is sufficient to move the most flinty heart, and to raise the cry of vengeance in the meekest bosom. Hence, the *catastrophe* in Hayti can furnish no ground to fear any thing of that nature, from a prudential emancipation in this country, especially, if means be used to prepare them for the blessing of liberty. But there is much to fear from continuing the slave system till they are driven to *claim* their rights and to *emancipate themselves*. Will they not, in those circumstances, adopt the reasoning of the Haytian Baron De Vastey? and what sophist can withstand the force of his arguments?

"But if one set of men," says he, "arrogate to themselves the right of reducing another to a state of slavery, have not these last an equal right to burst their bonds? What! can you *deprive* me of liberty, the most valuable earthly possession? Can you load me with disgraceful fetters? And am not I, your brother, and fellow creature, permitted to *reclaim* those rights which I derived from God alone, and of which none have a right to rob me: am I not to be allowed, I say, to burst my fetters and crush you beneath their weight? What abominable logic! What frightful morality! that would endeavour to prove slavery a blessing, and liberty a misfortune; and would endeavour to persuade men, that one set of them have a right to reduce the other to perpetual bondage, without these last being allowed the right or power of making an effort to throw off the yoke."

These are the arguments used by a Haytian, a *negro!* and I appeal to every man capable of forming a correct opinion of the merits of a writer, whether the "Letter to the Edinburgh Reviewers," in any part of it, contains such sound logic, such just reasoning, or such true rhetoric, as this single paragraph contains? And yet this is the language, and this the logic, of one of the "*degraded cast*"—Well, "*It is God who hath made us and not we ourselves.*" "*Shall the thing formed say to him which formed it, why hast thou made me thus?*" Shall this "Virginian" presume to question the justice of the Almighty, and in the pride of education ("alas we take *pride* in every thing, even in our" learning) shall he, in the pride of education, say to the Almighty, why hast thou formed me a worse logician than one of this "degraded cast," than this untutored negro? But methinks I hear this Virginian vociferating—ST. DOMINGO!—the MASSACRES OF ST. DOMINGO! Well, I will meet him on that point, full in the face of the subject: but it shall be by *proxy*. I will let one of the race he so much despises as a "*degraded cast*," have the honor of dislodging him from that pretended strong hold. I will confront the Baron De Vastey with him, and "*it is my pleasure*" to do this, as it will serve with the other extracts not only to silence his outcry about St. Domingo; but also to refute what he has said respecting negro intellect, and perhaps, convince him, that there is at least *one of the negro race*, whose abilities and eloquence as a writer are no way inferior to his own, and who as a logician, is far his superior.

"All the world knows," says De Vastey, "that republican France proclaimed liberty in this island. After having, for ten years enjoyed this blessing under the laws: after having fought and bled for France, and given the strongest proof of zeal, fidelity, and gratitude for the benefits we had received, they, without any visible motive, endeavoured to rob us of that liberty which they had granted; as if man, a mere butt for the caprice of his tyrants, was to lay aside and resume his bonds at their pleasure. Not content with employing force to bring us again under the yoke, they had recourse to art, and chicanery: they told us, *we were all brethren, and all equal in the sight of God and the republic.* Yet, while making this profession with their lips, they meditated in their hearts the horrible design, of either reducing us to slavery, or if that was found impracticable, *totally exterminating us.*

"Confiding in these fair promises, the majority of inhabitants, having long considered themselves as French, submitted without striking a blow or firing a musket. But we were soon strangely undeceived. No sooner did the French think themselves strongest, than they commenced their system of proscription, and *openly proclaimed the revival of slavery.*

"Mazeres, who wishes the world to judge of the Africans by the crimes they have committed, may judge of *his* countrymen from the slight sketch I shall give, of the dreadful atrocities of which *they* have been guilty towards us. O! horrible reflection! which fills our hearts with sorrow, hatred, and revenge.

"We have seen our fellow-citizens, friends, relatives, brothers, men, women, children, aged; without distinction of years or sex, dragged by these monsters to the most cruel punishments: some *burned to death*, others gibbeted, and left as food for birds of prey: some *thrown to dogs* to be devoured, while others, more fortunate perished beneath the poignard and the bayonet. In the places evactuated by the French, thousands of Haytians, who had fought in their defence, were so simple, as to trust their generosity; unwilling to abandon them in the hour of their distress, they followed them, and embarked on board their vessels with their wives, their children, and such property as they had been able to preserve from pillage; but hardly were these unfortunate wretches arrived on board, before they were loaded with chains and put down in the hold of the vessel, to be reserved for the most cruel punishments. Every evening these barbarians made some hundreds of victims mount upon the bridge, where they were bound, and put into large sacks, often along with children, they were then poignarded through the sacks, and thrown into the sea as food for the sharks.

"At other times they made republican marriages, like those of *La Vendee:* a man and a woman being bound together, with a cannon ball fastened to their necks, and then thrown into the Sea, amidst the acclamations of joy and exultations uttered by these monsters! Hundreds of victims crammed into the holds of the ships were suffocated by the fumes of sulpher: day dawned upon the horrors of the night. Our shores covered with the murdered corpses of our unfortunate countrymen, bore testimony to the crimes of the French, and gave a fatal warning of the melancholy lot which awaited us. Were I to recount all the acts of cruelty and injustice committed, I should fill volumes: I shall therefore confine myself to a few of the principal, to enable my readers to form some judgment of the barbarity with which we were treated.

"Eye and ear witness of the facts I relate, who can question their veracity?

"Three men were BURNED ALIVE in the *Place Royale, Cape Henry* (formerly Cape Francais.) On the morning of this event, the rumour circulated through the town. An immense crowd repaired to the spot, to view the preparations for this horrible *auto da fe:* Some attracted by unfeeling curiosity, others to convince themselves with their own eyes,

how far the barbarity and cruelty of our tyrants would lead them. I followed among these last, with a heart mourning the dreadful proceeding about to take place. On reaching the *Place Royale*, I saw two stakes fixed, one of which had two iron rings, and the other one, for receiving the necks of the three victims. The heaps of wood were artfully arranged about the stakes, with the addition of pitch, tar, and shavings, to render it more combustible. A vast crowd surrounded the pile; of whom some hung their heads, not daring to direct their eyes towards the fearful preparations; while others, the ex-colonists and their partizans, were unable to disguise their joy.

"At three in the afternoon, the French General Claparede, commander of the Cape, repaired with a numerous staff to the *Place Royale*. The three victims waited the hour of execution in an adjoining guard house. Claparede ordered them to be led to the pile; they arrived amidst the sound of martial music, as though in a triumphal march. The infamous Collet, Captain of Gendarmere, preceded them with joy and ferocity depicted in his countenance. Each of the victims bore a sugar cane in his hand: they were mounted upon the pile, and fastened to the stakes by the iron rings. All was ready, the sacrifice was about to commence. A death like silence pervaded the spectators. Claparede ordered fire to the pile; instantly the flames crackled, and began to envelope the feet of the sufferers; already might one fancy that he heard their cries, and saw them struggling amidst these dreadful torments. But oh! stoical courage! O! brave intrepidity! they did not stir so much as a foot, but remained immoveable, and with their attention fixed, set at defiance both their executioners and the flames which devoured them: they were quickly enveloped in flames; their bodies burst; the fat ran upon the pile, and a dense smoke, accompanied with a smell of roasted flesh, mounted to the sky. Terror seized the spectators; their hair stood on end; a cold sweat bedewed their bodies; they fled singly or dispersed, filled with horror; hatred and vengeance rankling at their hearts. The executioners alone remained: nor did they quit the spot till their victims were completely reduced to ashes.

"Can I give my readers any adequate description of the punishment of my countrymen, who were devoured by Dogs? Can my untutored pen describe with any thing like accuracy so horrible a picture? The imagination and understanding of my readers must supply the deficiency of my narrative.

"The first who were devoured by Dogs, were at the Cape, at a convent of *religious*, and in the house of the French General Boyer, chief of Rochambeau's staff.

"The theatre of these horrors was afterwards transferred to the Plantation Charrer at Haut-du-Cap, whither the blood-

hounds were conducted; and to increase their thirst for human blood, they were fed from time to time on human flesh. The day upon which there were any of these victims to be devoured was one of festivity to these butchers. Collet, Forestier, Teissert, Laurent, and Darac, commissaries of the police of the Cape, (all French, all ex-colonists) dressed themselves in full uniform, and put on their principal scarves, for the purpose of attending the execution, and accompanied by a crowd of *biped blood-hounds*, eager to aid the dreadful carnage made by their *quadruped brethren*, a thousand times less savage than themselves. Many days in advance they took the precaution of making the dogs fast, and, to whet their appetite, a victim was occasionally shown to them, and withdrawn just as they were about to dart upon it. At last the fatal moment arrived, when some unfortunate wretches were to be definitely given up to them; the unhappy beings were fastened to stakes in the presence of the commissaries, so as effectually to deprive them of the power of saving or of defending themselves.

"The dogs are loosed, and fly at their prey. In an instant, their victims are stripped of their flesh; their palpitating muscles hang down in ribbons, while the blood gushes from every pore: nothing can be heard but the screames of the sufferers. The victims, at their last gasp implore the mercy of these monsters: in vain do they solicit death as the last favour:—prayers are superfluous;—nothing can move the hearts of these tigers, divested of every feeling of humanity; they answer only by a convulsive grin, while they spirit on the dogs to their work of horror. At length the voice of the victims fails, their groans are no longer to be heard, while their mangled bodies still continue to palpitate. The dogs panting, pause to rest; they are surfeited with human flesh and blood; in vain the executioners encourage them anew; they refuse to continue their horrible carnage, and return to their kennels, leaving these monsters in human shape to complete with the poignard the yet unfinished work of death.

"Similar cruelties were perpetrated from one end of the island to the other.

"Toussaint Louverture voluntarily resigned his authority, and laid down his arms. he retired to his plantation divested of all his splendour; and, like the illustrious Roman, cultivated with his hands, the fields he had defended with his arms. He engaged us both by example and persuasion, to imitate his conduct, labouring and living peaceably in the bosom of our families. He was drawn into a snare, arrested and loaded with irons. His wife, his infant children, his whole family, his officers, shared his cruel fate.—Embarked in French vessels, they were carried to terminate their wretched career, by poison, in prison, and in irons.

"Generals James Maurepas and Charles Belair, died under their punishments. Maurepas was *nailed alive* to the main-mast of the Hannibal, *in the presence of his wife and children*, along with whom his corpse was consigned to the deep. The unfortunate Belair was shot along with his spouse; this heroine consoled him before her death, encouraging him to follow her example and die like a man. Thomany, Domage, Lamahotiere, and a whole crowd of officers and citizens of rank, died the death of felons; while those who escaped the gibbet or the assassin, fell by poison: Such was the fate of Generals Vilatte, Leveille, and Gautard; others were transported for sale to the Spanish main, or sent to France where they finished their career in the Galleys.

"Our forbearance being exhausted by a repetition of such crimes and villainies, we flew to arms; measured swords with our oppressors; beat them corps by corps, man for man, fighting with stones, and sticks shod with iron, for the preservation of our liberty, our existence, and that of our wives and children; after beholding torrents of our blood mingled with that of our tyrants, we remained masters of the field of battle."

My readers will understand my motives, in introducing so long an extract, and will receive it, as a complete refutation of the arguments, which the friends of the slave system are in the habit of bringing against Negro emancipation, founded on the occurrences at Hayti. They will perceive, that the people of colour, had been emancipated *ten years*, in that Island; and had made such good use of their liberty, that nothing was done on their part to interrupt the general safety or disturb the public peace, that the commencement of troubles originated with the vile attempt of the ex-colonists, to reduce them again to slavery, after they had for *ten years* enjoyed the blessing of liberty, and had given indisputable proofs of their gratitude for the extension of that blessing to them; that the cruelties which afterwards succeeded, commenced also on the part of the ex-colonists; that they were carried, by them, to such an unparelleled, horrible degree, that the very recital, must harrow up the soul of the reader, and fill him with horror and detestation—Cruelties, which can only be accounted for on the ground of the demoralizing and cruel tendency of the slave system, which converts men into monsters, divests them of every compassionate sensation and prepares them for any crime. And the reader will see that it was not till the forbearance of the Haytians was quite exhausted, by the scenes of horror and savage cruelties continually before them; and of which they were the victims, that they flew to arms, hurled the tremendous thunderbolts of vengeance back upon their oppressors, and extirpated them from that soil which they had so vilely polluted with crimes and blood.

This was nobly done! It was rising from degradation to the dignity of man! It was not a people, *comparatively* free, rising, and claiming their Independence; but it was a people, held in the vilest subjection, rising in the greatness of their strength; asserting those rights which God and nature entitled them to, and at once establishing, both their freedom as men, and their Independence as a people or nation; and I challenge this Virginian writer to "point out to us, if he can, in the history of the greatest and the highest, one single occurrence," more great or more just, than that "now presented to his view—one which gives to a whole people a claim" more "indisputable to" liberty, independence, and rank among the Nations; not even excluding, that ever to be admired, Declaration of American Independence. And, whatever this, or any other interested writer may insinuate, the pages of future, impartial history will record the two great events, of American and Haytian Revolutions as unsurpassed by any event whatever "in point of moral grandeur" "and in political importance."

If then the *sudden* emancipation in Hayti was effected, and no ill consequences arose therefrom, for the space of *ten years*, and *not then* till they were driven to desperation by

white oppressors, what cause would there be to fear any
; in this country from a *prudential*, and *gradual* emanci-
n? But if the abominable system should be continued,
all its attendant cruelties; if slave-holders should still
nue to advertise "He has my brand on his jaw" or
ast" (see the public papers;) if, I say this system should
ntinued, till slaves be driven to *emancipate themselves;*
the *hour* of *vengeance will be their's, and the reaction will*
ible. Well might the good Jefferson say on this subject,
mble for my Country, when I recollect that God is just
at his Justice cannot sleep forever."

ur Virginian, habituated to the shiftings, twistings, and
ng of ground, so commonly practised by some of his
ion, forgot that he was this time, acting a part at the
a literary public: and being determined to carry his point, if possible, though it might be at the expense of consistency; could take any hue; assume any form; or, like the satyr, blow both hot and cold with the same mouth. At one time we find him, as "a Virginian," identifying himself with the people of that State, and, in their language, denouncing the traffic in slaves, as a very pernicious commerce;" and what "had long been considered as a trade of great inhumanity." And speaking of the country as connected with the subject of the abolition, he calls it an "iniquity," of which they had "washed" their "hands." And yet, further on in his pamphlet, he attempts to justify the slave system, (which includes the internal traffic,) on the ground of natural justice

and the sacred Scriptures; and even attempts to prove, (*page* 42) that the slaveholder has a divine right to be, what the Reviewers call, "a scourger and murderer of slaves." He speaks of the negroes being the subjects of a "curse," which, he says, "Noah, in his *prophetic* wrath," denounced on Canaan: and has quoted authorities to prove, that they are the descendants of Ham; consequently of Noah, the common parent of mankind; and thereby, without intending it, has identified them with himself, as belonging to the same great human family; and yet, notwithstanding his having adopted this reasoning to justify slavery, as the ordination of God; he afterwards seems to question that identity, and to represent them, and various other people, as distinct races; and boldly asserts, without proof, and in direct opposition to plain historical facts, that each people respectively, are now, what they ever were in the graduated scale of existences. To these inconsistences, and to the use he has made of them, I shall pay some attention.

"The Arab of the desart now," says he, "is the Arab of the desart of the most ancient days to which our histories ascend." And, nearly verbatim in the language of the ex-colonists of St. Domingo; he says, "Africa will continue for ever to be, what it has been for nearly six thousand years—the residence of slavery and barbarism." &c. It is a little surprizing that this writer should be so unmindful of what he owes to his own reputation as a literary character: and to the honor of the family to which he is allied, as to subject himself to the charge of being either grossly ignorant of the history of the world; or if not ignorant, of at once insulting the understanding of those who are conversant with ancient history and of imposing on the credulity of those who are uninformed on that subject. Can he be a stranger to the high character which the Arabians once sustained; and of their very rapid advancement in arts, science and literature? Are they at present in that state? Will he set his face against the testimony of authentic history, and assert, that notwithstanding what has been handed down to us concerning them, they were always in the same state of barbarism and ignorance, in which they are at present involved? Or, has he still to learn, that Africa, despised, degraded Africa, was once the seat of knowledge, the very "cradle of the arts and sciences?" Must he be informed, that the Egyptians themselves were derived from the Ethiopians and that Pythagoras and all the learned of Greece and Rome went to Egypt to acquire learning and a knowledge of their mysteries of religion and science? Is he ignorant of what every reader of ancient history is acquainted with, *viz:* that the Greeks, highly celebrated as they have been for literature, science, the fine arts, and polished manners, were themselves ignorant, barbarous, and brutish, till they

were civilized by *colonies from Africa?* and that after Greece was civilized, the rest of Europe were as ignorant, debased, and brutal as those of Benin, of Zanguebar, or the most barbarous parts of Africa, can possibly be at the present day? Must I further inform him that almost the whole of Europe was in this state, without having acquired a single spark of knowledge for nearly four thousand years? and that during that time, the Africans had "filled the world with the fame of their wisdom, their laws, and their governments," while they (the Europeans, including the ancestors of the Americans) lay buried in pristine ignorance? The Europeans and their descendants have indeed, in modern time, made great advances in knowledge and the sciences: but it must not be forgotten, that they "inhabit countries, where the winters eat up the summers, and where necessity (the mother of invention) forces the exertion of their faculties; while the Africans are plentifully supplied, without much care or exertion, by their beneficent God, with every thing they require; that when satiated, they sit under their trees in tranquility and repose, enjoying the good of life without any effort. But when they were required to labour, they, however, set examples which astonished the world. I should exceed my intended limits, were I to describe their monuments, their statues, their obelisks, their public buildings, their caves, grottoes, and canals, which bade defiance to the works of man in any other part of the world at that day; and many of them, even to the present day. That the Ethiopians, Egyptians, &c. were originally identified with the negroes, I think may be fairly gathered from their statues, &c. as most of their best executed figures bore some resemblance of that "degraded cast." Many finely executed figures found in Africa, and even their emblem of wisdom and science, the Sphynx of Egypt, had the head breast and neck of a woman; but it was a woman with thick lips, a flat nose, and curled head.

But the conduct of the ancient Africans toward Europeans was just the reverse of the conduct of modern Europeans. Instead of enslaving the whites and instructing the Greeks in burning, pillaging and defrauding; instead of furnishing them with arms, or strong liquors to derange their intellects, and induce them to sell one another; instead of promoting an inhuman traffic, they introduced corn and instructed them in agriculture and learning.[5] Instead of inquiring into the moral and physical inferiority of these poor Greeks; they taught them to imitate themselves in the arts of society." Hence it was, that "Athens, Sparta, and Corinth flourished while all the rest of Europe was sunk in barbarism." From Greece, learning advanced to Italy, and from Italy by very slow gradations to the different parts of Europe. To Africa, despised Africa, therefore we must trace the origin of all our refinements.

Thus, taking my stand upon the high ground of historical evidence, I am justified in admonishing this calumniator of Africa, to be cautious in future, how he proclaims his own want of knowledge; and before he again makes such sweeping assertions, I would advise him to turn his attention to the history of nations, and make himself better acquainted with the ancient history of the world, than he appears to be at present.

I do not advise him to study the history of the Virginian slave system: as I think he can be neither ignorant of that, nor of the motives which influenced that people in 1772 when they petitioned the king for power to suppress the importation of slaves, from Africa, into that colony; but I advise him, for his own sake, to be more correct and honest, in future, in representing, what he must be sensible, were the true motives of the Virginians in addressing that petition, at that time, to the British government; and more faithful in stating what *he knows*, respecting the introduction of negroes into the colony, and the establishment of the slave system there.

I do not intend to be the champion of the British government. I mean not to justify *its measures*, either *past* or *present*. Such would indeed be attempting an impossibility. It would be undertaking to wash the Ethiop white. But if I cannot defend their corrupt measures; no more can I suffer their culpability to operate as an excuse, palliation, or exculpation, of the Virginian supporters of the slave system. Neither can I suffer the British people to be so far identified with their government, as to make them responsible for its faults and crimes. This writer however, either reasoning by analogy, from what he knows respecting the identity of the people and government of *this* country, has *ignorantly;* or, with a *real knowledge* of the non-identity of the people and government of England, has *designedly*, so treated the subject, as to completely identify the people with measures over which they have no more control, than the slaves in this country have over the slave laws.

Why has not this writer stated the origin of the first introduction of negro slaves into Virginia, and of the institution of slavery there? Why has he begun at so late a period as 1772? Did the British government come forward as a *volunteer* at the *commencement* of that inhuman traffic? At whose instance was it, that the British government "*allowed permission*" to introduce slaves into that colony? Was it at the request or petition of the *people of England?* Or was it, not rather at the *solicitation of the Virginian planters themselves*, who, having purchased large tracts of land, and not satisfied with the slow progress they made in bringing it into an arable state by the labor of white slaves sent there as convicts, *petitioned government to permit the importation o negroes from Africa into Vir-*

ginia in British or other bottoms? The acceding to this unhallowed petition, was certainly *wicked* on the part of the government. But to whom are we to ascribe the greater charge of wickedness? Whether was the more criminal; the government, which by acceding to this petition, was accessary to the crime, and shared in the guilt, or the people of Virginia with whom it originated, who were the first movers in it; from whom the petition was sent; for whose interest it was acceded to; and who were the direct actors in this wickedness; who first threw out the bait to the merchants, next purchased the slaves, and finally became the monsters, the acting monsters, in the practical crime of slave tyranny?

As this writer proclaims himself a "Virginian," let him "speak now for Virginia" in reply to the foregoing queries; and let him refute the remarks connected therewith, if able.

This writer places great stress on the Virginian petition of 1772; and on the duty laid on the importion of slaves. As to the latter; it is not stated in the caption of the law, that the duty was laid on, in order to restrict the importation of that *mercantile commodity*; but merely to raise a revenue. As to the petition, a little critical examination of its contents, and connecting therewith, the circumstances in which the opulent slave owners were placed, will make it appear, that their motives were not so pure, nor their humanity so genuine, as he would represent it. The instrument contains certain ostensible reasons for petitioning. The two prominent ones are, the trade being carried on by British Merchants; and that their prayers were founded on *fear for their Safety*. Another powerful motive, though not expressed, seems to have influenced the opulent slave holders and induced them to petition for the suppression of the importation trade, *viz.* that of raising the value of their slave *property*. They had reared or *bred* on their estates, a large stock of Slaves. They had more than were necessary to perform their work. They however found the *breed of slaves*, the most profitable *live stock* they could *rear for sale*, and nicely calculated, that their value would be as much enhanced by stopping the importation of them, as the value of any domestic manufactured goods is enhanced by the non-importation of those articles; and upon this principle they seem to have acted: for they have done nothing during the period of more than 40 years, which has elapsed since they became independent, to eradicate slavery, or to prevent an *internal traffic in* slaves: but the dismembering of families; the sending off large droves of manacled slaves, and the cruelties of the slave system still continue. Where then was the sincerity of their professions of humanity, as expressed in the petition, and reiterated by this writer?

He has the effrontery to tell the advocates for the abolition of the slave system, that their humanity costs them no-

thing; but procures for them distinction as well as profit. To repel this charge, I need but mention a few well known characters in this country, who have manifested the disinterestedness of their humanity by the sacrifices they have made in the cause. Can such motives be imputed to Bushrod Washington? Will this writer say that the two Brothers, Thomas and Ferdinando Fairfax, made *no sacrifice*, when they liberated all their slaves, and made provision for their support? When Mr. Jefferson spoke against slavery, had *he* nothing to give up? Was it nothing for the great Washington, to fix the manumission of all his slaves, and make provision for such as needed it?

I shall examine the defence he has set up, grounded on "revealed Religion, previously to meeting his remarks on the principles of the Law of nature. The ground he has here taken he has attempted to support by a fourfold kind of argument, *viz.* Prophecy, Example, Mosaic Law, and the Gospel.

In meeting him on these grounds, it is proper to notice, that he does not profess to enter upon this part of his defence of slavery, as an advocate for *Truth:* but like a true son of the bar, ready to catch at any advantage which presents itself, determines to baffle, if possible, where he cannot refute. And though he cannot say, "that by the principles of natural law, or the precepts of revealed Religion, slavery was a legitimate state of human existence" and "begs it to be understood that he is not giving—at least it is not his object to give—his own opinions:" Yet he has availed himself of the supposed authority of the Scriptures, and endeavoured to represent those who condemn Slavery as a crime, to be guilty of "*blasphemy against the most High.*"

This kind of argument may sometimes succeed at the bar, where the *interest of the Client*, not the *justice of the cause*, is intrusted to the advocate: though, to do justice to the profession, I fully admit, that the most eminent Lawyers have too much integrity to adopt this as a rule of proceeding: but in this controversy, where the interest of a whole people, and the cause of humanity are at stake, the *Lawyer* ought to have been dropt and the *man*, the honest unbiased *man* alone should have appeared. Having however thus committed himself, he must now be identified with the arguments he has chosen to adopt, and it behoves him to defend them as if they were really his own and accorded with his own opinions. For to what purpose has he introduced them unless he believes them, and considers them conclusive.

On the authority of Bishop Newton, he says, that the Africans "are the descendants of Canaan," the Grandson of Noah. If so, they must be of the same original descent as ourselves, and consequently our brethren. It then must follow,

that any arguments which this writer may have advanced that imply a contrary opinion, are overthrown by such admission: for if the Africans originally sprang from the same common parentage, they cannot be a distinct race, sprang from an originally distinct stock or parentage. But, says he, "Noah in his prophetic wrath said, *Cursed be Canaan*," &c. I should be glad to learn, through what authentic source of information this writer has arrived at the certainty, that Noah, just awaking from beastly drunkenness, was divinely inspired with the gift of prophecy? Do the Scriptures contain this information? Have succeeding events proved his wrath prophetic? Were the descendants of Ham, slaves to the descendants of Shem and Japheth, any more than the two latter descendants were to the former? Were Africans more held in slavery during the first 5000 years of the world, than either Europeans or Asiatics? Did the slaves among the ancients consist principally of persons of colour? Or, did the Negro slave *trade* commence more than a few centuries back? Unless these queries can be met with well substantiated affirmatives, the divine right of slavery can derive no support from the supposed *prophetic* wrath of Noah.

Nor does slavery derive any support or justification from what is recorded respecting the ancient Patriarchs having slaves. The plain historical narrative which is given of the actions and conduct of Men in that day can be no justification of such actions or conduct; much less can it authorize the same in the present enlightened age and state of the world. The world was then in its infancy, and every thing was immature. The most civilized were but in a savage state, compared with the present state of society and of the world: and though slavery is mentioned in the Scriptures and not condemned by the narrators, it must be remembered, that they, as faithful historians, narrated things just as they were, frequently stating the simple fact without any comment. The bare mention of Abraham, Isaac, &c. having a number of servants or slaves, can be no more a justification of the practice, than Abraham's taking his maid servant to his bosom; Jacob having a plurality of wives and concubines: Lots daughters committing incest with their father, David's having several wives; The Old Prophet of Bethel being guilty of lying, Ahithophel's committing suicide, can authorize and justify polygamy, fornication, incest, lying or suicide in the present day, for in all the foregoing cases, these things are narrated without any comment or expressed disapprobation, just the same as the other.

But, says this writer, the "Jewish code of Laws" "authorizes slavery." As however he has admitted that he has not taken the trouble to ascertain what he should or should not believe; he assumes too much, when he says, "the Pen-

tateuch must be abandoned as an absolute imposture, if the Law authorizing slavery *is* (be) not of divine original" Perhaps I may be able to shew, that as this writer has given himself so little *trouble* to understand what he reads or writes; instead of the friends of humanity rejecting the "Pentateuch as an absolute imposture," they will reject his application of it, as absolute sophistry, founded on absolute ignorance of the drift and connexion of Scripture.

Moses, as a wise legislator, adapted his laws to the then state, habits, and information of the people for whom they were framed. In that age of barbarism, it was impossible to bring any whole people to adopt, and be governed by a code of laws which were founded on, and in every respect conformable to the strict principles of Justice; all that could be done in that ferocious age, was to soften and restrain, not totally abolish every species of cruelty and injustice, which long habit had established. Moses adapted himself to the existing state of things; and his laws, however apparently severe some of them may seem to us in this enlightened period; were but substitutes in the place of greater cruelties, and imposed real restraints on the Jewish nation. And in so doing he acted as the friend of the people and the faithful and approved servant of Jehovah. I expect, the great founder of Christianity understood the nature of the Mosaic precepts as *well* as this writer, and was as *able* to explain their designs as *he* can be. He called them the commands of Moses and in speaking of one of them, which stood just upon the same foundation as those which respected slavery, said "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you," &c. "but from the beginning it was not so." Or as the parrallel place reads it, "for the hardness of your heart, he wrote you this precept, but from the beginning of the creation, &c." There is enough contained in the Books of Moses, to show, that slavery was not considered by him as a "legitimate state of human existence" and that he did not consider them as true and just property. Had he considered them as such, he would not have *commanded* any persons to harbor or secret such property from the rightful owner. Yet he expressly charges, "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master a servant (slave) which is escaped from his master unto thee: he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him*" *Query.* Does not this precept, sanction the conduct of certain persons towards "runaway slaves" which this writer points at, when he sarcastical hints at their "silent meetings?" And may it not serve to encourage many conscientious persons to afford an asylum to the poor oppressed Negroes?

Nothing can be gathered, in support of the slave system, from the language of the New Testament. The allusions made

to servants in the parables, is nothing in proof of the justice of that system. In all parables there is one main object in view, and every thing else introduced, tends to that object: and it is the design of such parable, not the language or epithets used in dressing it up, that we are to look to for instruction. So far as parables may be considered preceptive, we must look to the end the speaker had in view, for that precept. So, of the man that fell among thieves, the great object of Jesus was to teach the enquirer whom he ought to consider as his neighbour, and perform to him, though an enemy the duties of mercy. This was his method when he taught by parables.

His plain unadorned precepts, give no countenance to slavery: for he inforced upon men this doctrine; that they were all brethren; the equal children of one heavenly Father; and the equal objects of his kind and paternal care. Nor could he possibly mean to countenance slavery or sanction it as a divine appointment, when he said, in the language which this writer has quoted, "I came not to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to fulfill." He could not intend, that he came to fulfil, or sanction, that statute of Moses, which, while it imposed certain restrictions, did not wholly prohibit slavery; any more than he intended many other things, allowed by the Mosaic code: for if by the term law, as used by Jesus, we are to understand, every thing expressed in the Mosaic code; then nothing could be left out: but we find that this quotation forms a part of that excellent sermon, delivered by him on the Mount; in which, he plainly expressed his dissent from many things contained in that code: and, unfortunately for the argument which our Virginian has grounded thereon, he, in that very Sermon, hath given us his meaning of the phrase, and informed us what he understood to be the sum and substance of the law and the prophets" which he came "to fulfil." I request this writer to attend to his words, and reconcile it with his own conduct, as a slave-holder and a slave defender, if he can. "Whatsoever ye would," saith Jesus, "that men should do to you, do ye *even so* to them: *for this is the law and the prophets.*" Would the advocates for slavery like to be held in bondage as slaves themselves? If not, how are they conforming to this christian precept while they hold their fellow men in that state of bondage and degradation? Is this doing to others as they would have others do to them? And yet this is the "law and the prophets," which Christ said, he came not to destroy but to fulfil. And indeed, Moses went a little further than this writer was desirous to inform us about, for he commanded the *manstealer* to be put to death. "He that stealeth a man and selleth him; or if he be found in his hands, *he shall surely be put to death.*" The admonitions of Paul, give no countenance to slavery. The enemies to the slave system, if good men, are in the habit of giving the same

admonitions to servants as this writer reminds us, Paul did. There are two things however that I must notice. The first is, that this writer's quotation from *Timothy* is mutilated, perverted, and misapplied. He has omitted the phrase or sentence which precedes what he has quoted, and which stands connected with it. "These things teach and exhort" which evidently embraced all the directions and instructions he had given to Timothy, in the five preceding chapters, and was not confined to servants in particular. In the second place, I must tell him, that he has been very unfortunate in introducing the case of Onesimus the servant of Philemon. I would advise him in future to read for himself the scripture which he quotes in defence of his system; for notwithstanding the authority of Dr. Hewlett: and his own triumph, he has entirely mistaken the conduct of Paul on that occasion. He did not send Onesimous back to Philemon in the capacity of a slave. He requested him to receive him, "*Not now as a servant but above a servant, a brother beloved.*" And again, he saith: "*If thou count me therefore, partner, receive him as myself.*" So far from the Scriptures authorizing slavery, the general scope of them is against it. The Christian religion inculcates principles directly opposed to it, and no man, who understands the precepts of the gospel, and is influenced by the spirit of the great Saviour; or who is worthy to be called a Christian, will ever, either advocate, or countenance, so iniquitous a system.

As to natural law, this writer has but glanced at it. He has indeed introduced a few names of great men, but he has barely given us to understand, that it was the opinion of those "jurists and divines, that slavery may be justified on principles of natural law," but he has given none of their arguments in favour of slavery. I am sorry he has omitted this; because, had he done so, perhaps I might have discovered, that he was as capable of misapplying their language, as he has been that of the Reviewers. This however he has done, he has mentioned Paley as one of the number, although Paley was almost one of the first who, in England, made exertions for the abolition of the trade.

He defines natural law, or the law of nature, to be "right reason and justice independent of municipal law, applied to individuals:" but he has not attempted to *prove*, that slavery is consistent therewith; he has barely *asserted* that it is. I am willing to abide by his definition of natural law: and the question now is what is "right reason and justice independent of municipal law? This must lead us back to first principles; and to view man in the enjoyment of his natural rights, unrestricted by social compact. Man is the creature of God; and God is the equal Father of all, and, to use the words of the Declaration of Independence, we must "hold

these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal —that they are endowed by the Creator, with certain *unalienable* rights—that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." In this state man has no other control but the exercise of his own reason, and the guidance of the inherent principle of justice, which the great Parent of all has implanted in every bosom, *viz:* that of doing no injury to others, or in the language of that precept which is the sum and substance of the "law and the prophets," and of all just law, of doing to others as he would have others do to him. If then, all men be naturally equal and have an equal right to liberty, then no one can, without violating this natural law, deprive his fellow men of that blessing; and it was on this *fundamental* principle, that the American people rested their claim to independence. But if no one has a right to deprive another of this liberty, it follows that no one has a right to hold another in bondage who is already deprived thereof, because the law of nature, which gives a man a right to enjoy liberty, and prohibits its being wrested from him, gives him also a claim to a restoration to liberty, *after* he has been deprived thereof. This principle was also thus acted upon by the American people, when they reclaimed their liberty and struggled for, and obtained, a restoration of what they had been deprived of.—Justify the slave system, and you annul the principles of natural law.—Say it is just, and correct to hold men as slaves, and you justify the conduct of the British government towards this country, prior to the revolution. Say the slaves are your property and you have a rightful dominion over them; so said the British government when they pursued their oppressive measures. Ye were called the subjects of the king, over which he had a rightful dominion; and even the great eternal was insulted in the national churches, with a standing form of prayer, beseeching him, to turn the hearts of his (the king's) rebellious subjects in North America. It was even considered a *divine* right which he had over you. Deny the claim of the negroes to emancipation, and you deny the justice of your own proceedings in the revolutionary struggle. If man, according to first principles, be, by the law of nature entitled to liberty: and if his right to that blessing be *unalienable;* then, no social compact can repeal that law: no order of things can make that *alienable* which in its own essential nature is *unalienable*. Man, in forming, or coming into, the social compact does not surrender that right, for that which is *unalienable*, can neither be surrendered, nor justly wrested from its possessor. But slaves *are not* under any social compact: they have made no surrender; they have given up nothing: they have been violently robbed of every thing: they have been stripped of their birth-rights, degraded and debased, and now their oppressors

claim them as their property, and talk of the injustice of depriving them of that property.

It would be derogating from the character of the Parent of the universe to impute to him the crimes of men, and to make him a party with them in their injustice and cruelties. He is no respector of persons. He hath made of one blood the whole race of man to dwell on all the face of the earth; therefore let not the slave-holders any more presume to call him their "ally," or accuse him of unequal dealings with his rational creatures

It would far exceed my limits, were I to enter upon a full refutation of all the calumnies he has heaped upon the British people, while identifying them with the conduct of their government. Suffice it for the present to state, that the great mass of the British people were decidedly against slavery, long, very long before the abominable trade was abolished; that they did all in their power to put an end to it; that not only the public prints and the productions of other writers reprobated the trade: but whole communities left off using sugar, and various commodities which were known to be cultivated by slaves; and, that had the people of England that control over *their* government which the people of this country have over *theirs*, the trade would have been abolished twenty or thirty years before it was abolished by this country.

We are required to point out the means of removing the evil as well as condemn it. This may be done in a few plain words. Viewing it *morally*, I will say: do justly—do as you would be done by—emancipate—give up the property you *never had a right to hold;* and an approving conscience and the blessing of heaven, will be ample indemnity—Is *safety* an object of importance? Look at the example of the northern States and the result. Or look at St. Domingo, *during the ten years that succeeded emancipation there:* and like them secure the gratitude and attachment of the coloured population by *voluntarily* abolishing slavery. But if individual or public safety be *nothing to you*, look at St. Domingo *after* the period I have mentioned: rivet the chains of your slaves; withhold emancipation, till the fast increasing coloured population be strong enough to *emancipate themselves:* and then blame yourselves for the tremendous consequences.

Before I conclude, I must remind the reader, that the Edinburgh Reviewers have made no attack on the American people, save on the subject of slavery. On every other subject, they have spoken highly of this country. They have past high encomiums on its government, its laws, its public servants, the frugal management of its expences, and on the independent spirit which pervades all ranks of American citizens. The strong epithets, and the severe expressions which they have used, are all directed against the slave system, and

against that system exclusively. And these were called forth on reviewing the statements given of the cruelties, the shocking cruelties, practised under that system and sanctioned (some of them at least) by the laws. And they have more especially condemned the existence of slavery in this country, than in any other, because this is the freest, and best governed country in the world, and better understand the principles of liberty. Hence they have acted agreeably to that gospel maxim, "He who *knoweth* his master's will and *doeth it not*, shall be beaten with *many* stripes." And, agreeably to this maxim I also have acted in this refutation, making a difference between the writer who *knowingly* and designedly perverts and misrepresents the language and intention of those against whom he writes, and he who *mistakenly* does so.

The injustice and cruelties which I have recorded are but a sample, a very small sample of what I could have introduced; my object being to defend the Reviewers against the unworthy attack made upon them, and to impress the public with the cruelty and demoralizing tendency of the system, a system, which, to the honor of this country, I am happy to say, is detested by the GREAT BODY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

In taking leave of our Virginian for the present, I would recommend, that in future, he no more attempt to make the Almighty and his Revelation, allies with him in this atrocious cause. His turning over the pages of the Bible in search of something to justify the iniquitous practice, strongly reminds me of the lines of Moore, with which, with a little alteration, I shall conclude this pamphlet.

> Just God! how awful must thou look,
> When such a wretch before THEE stands,
> Unblushing with thy sacred Book;
> Turning it's leaves with blood-stain'd hands
> And wresting from it's page sublime,
> His creed for slavery and crime

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 839 186 A